



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

book is welcome and important. It is safe to say that every individual with a living interest in our national education ought to read it with care; but it is equally certain that it will be least used where it is most needed.

F. B. N. HELLEMS

---

*Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV*, recensuit CAROLUS HOSIUS.  
Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. xiv+190. M. 2.

This edition at once takes its place as the standard text edition of Propertius. In the Teubner series it is the successor of Müller's edition which antedates it by 41 years. The work is a conservative one, and no startling novelties are to be found therein. It is a careful digest of the work of scholars in the last generation.

The preface opens with the statement that one who writes concerning the Propertian MSS these days must repeat much that is trite; that Baehrens in his edition of 1880 laid a firm foundation not yet overturned; that he clearly distinguished the classes, chose good representatives of each, and carefully collated the variant readings; but that he erred grievously in judging his MSS and in restoring his text. These words show clearly the trend of Hosius' edition. The opinion expressed may be said to be the current one, though the reviewer, for one, does not agree with this high estimate of Baehrens' work. In the *Corrigenda* the editor states that he received the reviewer's article on the MSS of Propertius (*Classical Philology* VI [1911], 282) too late for use. It is possible that he would have modified his views concerning the MSS had he received it earlier. No new MSS are made use of and little is added to our knowledge of the familiar ones, only F having been re-examined by Hosius. As a result of this new study of F, Baehrens' miserable collation (for which he practically apologized) is corrected in a number of places, though by no means in all. Hosius, like Baehrens, fails to distinguish between the correcting hands—a matter of detail which is by no means unimportant (see *Classical Philology*, *loc. cit.*). A few gleanings from photographs of N of which Hosius availed himself are added. N is rightly rated highest, but the erroneous statement commonly made is repeated that it alone is free from the interpolations of the humanists. It is even suggested that A is a copy of Petrarch's MS (cf. *Classical Philology*, *loc. cit.*). In 1891 Hosius suggested Neap. IV F 20 as an additional representative of the AF family where A fails us, but he temporarily abandons this as a result of Postgate's well-grounded objections and his own re-examination, until a careful study (apparently undertaken by a student of his)<sup>1</sup> will establish the truth. The Holkham MS (Postgate's L) is adopted into the apparatus as a good representative of the AF class. Baehrens' DV are accepted

<sup>1</sup> Since this review was written there has appeared (1912) a Greifswald dissertation by A. Hänel, a student of Hosius, entitled *De Propertii Codice Neapolitano 268 (=IV F 20)*. Hänel maintains that this MS is of some value.

as a class. The Lusaticus is very properly rejected as of no value. Thus NAFLDV are the MSS adopted into the apparatus. Other MSS are occasionally referred to under the all-embracing sign s.

The obscurity and inconcinnity of Propertius has been responsible for an extraordinarily large number of conjectural emendations. Hosius has gathered some very interesting statistics. In 18 printed editions and about 250 articles known to him, he has found for the 4,010 verses more than 7,300 conjectures, about 1,000 transpositions (not counting the numerous ones of Scaliger), about 85 lacunae, and about 450 suspected verses (not counting those of Carutti and Heimreich). In one poem of 102 lines (iv. 11) he counts no less than 360 conjectures (not including transpositions), and for one line (iv. 4. 55) he lists 32 conjectures by 30 scholars. He rightly concludes that extreme caution is necessary, and that here, if anywhere, the critic must stand by the MSS. Some excellent remarks on the style of Propertius are concluded with the warning that he who expects a writer to be clear, balanced, and consistent should keep away from Propertius.

In the apparatus, which is at the foot of the page, all the variations of N (except differences of spelling) are given. But of the other MSS only those readings which are of importance for the text (in the editor's judgment), and many which indicate the relations of the MSS are included. In other words, the apparatus is generally sufficient for all readers except those who are studying the MS problem.

As in Baehrens' edition, the *testimonia* are given below the text. No real additions are made to those already known—only reminiscences from inscriptions that are either inept, such as *fidus amicus* (what could one not prove by the English "faithful friend"!) and *verba loqui*, or else are found also in other authors.

Extreme conservatism is shown in the text. From a rapid glance through the apparatus it appears that not a single emendation of Hosius' own is introduced into the text. Nor do there seem to be more than about 15 of his modestly made suggestions even in the apparatus. None of these are convincing. No conjectures of scholars since Baehrens seem to be accepted into the text—unless there be a few which have escaped the reviewer. Recent scholars who are mentioned most often in the apparatus are Housman, Postgate, Birt, and Leo.

Hosius follows Baehrens in putting too much trust in DV. It seems to be certain that DV are of no value (except as offering plausible conjectures) where NA, or (after ii. 1. 63 where A ends) NF agree (see *Classical Philology*, *loc. cit.*). We should therefore accept the reading of these MSS wherever possible, e.g. iii. 11. 24, where NF have *Nec* and DV (followed by Hosius) have *Ne*.

In addition to the *Initia Carminum* and the *Index Nominum*, there is a most convenient *Index Metricus et Prosodiacus* with sub-headings *Caesurae*, *Pedes Quinti et Sexti*, *Elisiones*, etc., and an *Index Grammaticus*, which far

surpasses Müller's because of the excellent arrangement by declensions, etc. Misprints have not been searched for by the reviewer, but incidentally the odd-looking *Gwynu*, for *Gwynn*, in the apparatus to ii. 22. 44, was noted.

We are grateful to Hosius for the pains he has taken in the production of this conservative book. It marks an advance in that it offers a judicious presentation of current theory. There is no breaking away at any point, and therein lies his weakness as well as his strength.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

---

*Cacus der Rinderdieb.* Von FRIEDRICH MÜNZER. Program zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, Universitätsbuchdruckerei, 1911. Pp. 136.

The appearance of another dissertation upon the Hercules and Cacus myth within a year of the publication of Winter's *The Myth of Hercules at Rome* in the University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, IV, 171-273 (reviewed in *Classical Philology*, VII, No. 1, 98-99, by Walter Miller) is evidence of the continued interest of students of religion in this vexed question. While the great value of Winter's thesis lies perhaps in his second chapter on the "Relationship and Sources of the Versions," the most interesting part of Münzer's study is his analysis of the myth in the Augustan poets and historians. The work is perhaps more significant as a study of the literary and mythological technique of the Augustan age than as a direct contribution to the analysis of the Cacus myth itself. A brief summary of the four chapters will show wherein Münzer's treatment of the material differs in emphasis and conclusions from Winter's.

In his introduction (pp. 1-7) Münzer informs us that he will discuss Cacus rather than Hercules, assuming the Greek origin of the hero, that he will confine himself to the literary tradition of the Augustan age, and the researches of pre-Augustan and post-Augustan antiquarians and commentators. In chap. i, pp. 8-26, we have "Technik und Disposition der Erzählung bei Vergil, Properz, Ovid."

Münzer's method is here one of great minuteness, not to say excessive diffuseness. The main result of the analysis is to show that Vergil gave himself free scope for poetic invention by deviating from the tradition and by romantically elaborating the figure of Cacus and the fight with Hercules, that Propertius iv. 9 eliminates Evander from the story, and that Ovid *Fasti* i. 543 ff., while closer to Vergil, has a more consistent regard for the unities of time and place. The results of the second chapter, "Analyse der Erzählung bei Vergil, Properz, Ovid" (pp. 27-70) are more important, for here by a careful comparison of the three poets Münzer deduces the common "mythic formula." This formula should, however, have been definitely stated. Equally significant are the differences. In general Vergil's narrative